

CHRISTIANITY and *CRISIS*

A BI-WEEKLY JOURNAL OF CHRISTIAN OPINION

Volume 1, No. 2.

February 24, 1941

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Whosoever Will Save His Life . . .

SOME isolationists and interventionists are primarily concerned with the effect of foreign policy upon national interest, while other supporters and opponents of the administration's program judge it primarily according to their estimate of its effect upon the preservation of democratic civilization. There are thus both "nationalistic" and "democratic" schools of thought in each of the opposing political camps. (Since pacifist clergymen have joined the "America First" movement, we do not pretend that the distinction is hard and fast.)

The democratic interventionists believe we can serve the democratic cause most effectively, both at home and abroad, by helping to defeat tyranny wherever it imperils free peoples. The isolationists believe that our best contribution to the democratic cause would be to insure that an island of democracy may survive upon this continent in a possible ocean of anarchy and tyranny.

There is no moral issue between the nationalistic isolationists and interventionists. Neither side professes primary allegiance to any cause transcending national interest. The issue between them is purely strategic. On the strategic issue the nationalistic isolationists may be wrong, but they are certainly not as wrong as the "idealistic" and democratic isolationists. They may be wrong, because even when we are preserving only physical life extreme caution may, on occasion, be a less effective defence than a resolute and daring advance against great peril.

Yet the nationalistic isolationists, if mistaken, are not as much in error as the democratic isolationists. The "life" which they are trying to preserve is not subject to the law that "whosoever will save his life shall lose it." In purely physical terms you may be able to save life by trying to save it. You can run from danger, or make an ignominious peace with evil, or accept slavery as the price of survival. The law, that life is lost if we seek to save it, makes sense only when we regard "life" in broader terms than mere physical existence or material advantage. In such terms, which include qualitative aspects of existence, the paradox of Christ is relevant to all human

experience. We know how easily we may rob life of its dignity and majesty by clinging to it too desperately. We may lose it spiritually by seeking to save it physically.

In international affairs national interest is analogous to life primarily as physical existence. Democratic civilization, as it is imperfectly embodied in our western history, represents that qualitative dimension of life, which is lost if we seek to save it too narrowly or too frantically. That is why the democratic isolationists are in more grievous error than the nationalistic isolationists. We might conceivably preserve the power and the prestige of our nation in a Nazi world. It is hardly conceivable that we could preserve our democratic values if the victory of the Nazis had been brought about partly by our indifference to the democratic cause. The idea of an island of democracy in a tyrannical world is a snare and delusion.

How could we preserve respect for the rights of minority groups, if we accepted the victory of a national policy based upon race pride? If, as Mr. Norman Thomas believes, the defence exertions which are now required are inimical to democratic justice, how could our democracy survive decades of military economy and naval expansion? And how far would we have to go in militarization, if we faced the constant threat of a nation which has reduced civilization to efficiency and the preoccupation of a military camp?

The price of doing business with a Nazi Europe, and possibly with a Nazi Latin America, would be to meet Nazi labor costs. These costs will be determined by a combination of enslaved labor and the efficiency of a technical civilization—a combination which the world has never before known. If our democracy is bound to perish under the weight of military expenditures now, what would be its future in the rigors of competition with slave labor?

Since a Nazi philosophy, not yet crowned with victory, finds many devotees and imitators among us even now, what would be the consequence of a Nazi triumph upon vast sections of our population?

Could we preserve respect for liberty, if experience had proved efficiency to be more important than liberty for all those who take the short, and not the long view of history? Could we maintain the cultural pluralism, so essential to democratic harmony among a diverse people, if a "master race" paraded the fruits of its pride before the world and excited the sleeping monster of race prejudice to new vitality?

Clearly, democratic civilization belongs to that dimension of life which is more than mere life. Its most basic quality is obedience to universal standards of justice, which restrain individual and collective impulses of egoism. Therefore, every effort to preserve democracy among us, which involves a studied indifference to the Nazi debasement of culture, its enslavement of nations, and its glorification of naked self-interest, is self-defeating. We destroy the very standards which we are trying to preserve. That is to lose the life we seek to save.

No one could claim that any alternative open to us in this sad world offers democracy an easy way to health. The exertions which confront us, if we decide to make the cause of democracy our own, may well accentuate known weaknesses in our life and place a great strain upon the residual health of the democratic world. But the alternative of regarding democratic life as a frail invalid who must be guarded against the buffetings of a tumultuous world is obviously a counsel of defeatism, and seeks to preserve what is spiritual by strategies which are lawful only for the physical life.

The idealists who want to preserve democracy by insulating it upon this continent have usually fought analogous doctrines in domestic politics, where the problem of war is not faced. It is, therefore, the dogma that nothing can be worse than war which betrays them into this inconsistency.

The Paradox of Peace

A deep cause of confusion in the present crisis is the failure to grasp what peace means in its Christian sense. This failure is responsible for inhibitions among millions of our people, making it difficult for them to reach conclusions about the issues involved in our contemporary situation. It is no less responsible for their inertia and inability to take decisive action once decisions are reached. Many who beg to be left in peace identify peace with freedom from disturbing cares and from claims, which if accepted, would shatter the settled routine of life.

Christian peace is something quite different from this. It is the state of the soul which is born when life is adjusted to the disturbing will of God. It is the peace of waters which have left the placid quiet of an upland lake and pour tumultuously through the perils and surprises of their river bed, but which

have the security of their channel and the certainty of their goal. It was this peace of commitment to the will of God which Christ possessed and which on the night of His agony He bequeathed to His disciples, saying, "My peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you."

The peace of the world which Christ contrasts with His own is a flight from unpleasantness, whether by adjustment to the world of convention, or by escape into fantasy. A peace from which all awareness of life's tragic sense is excluded is not a Christian peace. Far deeper and more crucial than the question which divides pacifists and non-pacifists is this question: does any condition of society or the soul merit the name of peace in a Christian sense unless it consists in active commitment to the disturbing will of God? Where such a peace is sought and found within each soul as an inner possession, it may also become an outward reality within the Christian community. For the acrimony of party strife will be mitigated by the charity which flows from the inner security which each contestant has in the divine mercy.

Calling All Prophets

If the Christian enterprise is in peril, the high tide of its testing will come in the days when proposals and counter-proposals will be made for the organization of the post-war world. Unless we establish basic criteria for our thought and action, we shall not be able to give united testimony at times of decision.

What is "the wave of the future" for the follower of Jesus? He believes in the unity of all mankind under God. But this vague picture needs now the sharp underlining of conviction that this united human family must be one of free women and men. The Christian enterprise has existed in a world part slave and part free, its salty efficacy weakened by its own acceptance of inequalities and injustices. Now that it has been directly challenged from without by another way of life, can it survive if it consents to human enslavement?

We have succumbed to the imperative of a man-made time table of destruction. If it is written in a book, it will come to pass. Many people are meeting this wave of the future with what they believe to be creative resignation. Is there more faith in this blue-print for world chaos than in the charter for the Christian—the building of the Kingdom of God on earth?

The faith of the Christian is invested in the Person of Jesus Christ. Can that faith exist in a world order which would not contain the seed-ground for Christlike character—freedom and truth?

The Christian Ethic and Political Strategy

JOHN C. BENNETT

CHRISTIAN pacifism in America usually involves three convictions. It rejects all participation in violence which has as its intention the taking of human life. It assumes that such violence is not only in itself the greatest evil, but that it is regularly self-defeating. It also affirms that there is in every situation a strategy of love that is available to the Christian. If at any given time the Christian does not see what that strategy is, he must still refuse to participate in violence and take upon himself the immediate consequences of such refusal, leaving the more remote consequences in the hands of God.

I think that in the American Churches all of those three convictions are usually found together. There is a good deal of confusion about the relation between the Christian strategy that is available to the individual and the policies that are the real alternatives for the nation. Most Christian pacifists in America seem to assume that the nation should even now adopt a policy which would at least be controlled by the pacifist rejection of violence even though, quite obviously, such a policy would not be based upon the motives of Christian pacifism. There are pacifists, however, who believe that the nation cannot adopt a pacifist policy and that therefore the pacifist should not bring pressure upon the nation to adopt a policy of isolationism or to encourage Britain to negotiate prematurely with the Axis or to surrender. This latter position has been well presented by Elton Trueblood in an article on "The Quaker Way" in *The Atlantic Monthly* (December, 1940) and by C. J. Cadoux in his recent book, *Christian Pacifism Re-examined*. But it seems to be taken for granted by most Christian pacifists in America that even if the nation cannot act from the motives of the Christian pacifist, the policy that externally resembles pacifism, political isolationism for the duration of the war, even at the expense of the encouragement of the victory of the Axis powers, is better than the policy of determined resistance to the extension of tyranny. Most American pacifists take for granted that pacifism is a self-sufficient political strategy open in all circumstances to individuals and to nations alike. If pressed, they might not always admit that theoretically, but the policies which they advocate seem based upon that assumption.

NOTE: Part of this material will be included in a book by the author entitled, *Christian Realism*, soon to be published by Charles Scribners' Sons.

Pacifism as Essential Christianity

All discussion of Christian pacifism should begin with the recognition that it has some claim to be regarded as an essential Christian point of view. It is an extension of aspects of the teachings of Jesus and rests in part on a generalization from Jesus' own dealing with evil. It depends for its influence, at least in the western world, on Christian moral sensitivity. In the hardest places, it would have no message of hope if it were not for Christian teaching concerning the Cross and if it were not for faith in the God of love as the Lord of history. Moreover, for the pacifist's contention that violence is self-defeating there is impressive evidence. I do not believe that it is enough to refer to the Christian emphasis upon sin to destroy the pacifist claim that he represents essential Christianity. The argument based upon the fact of sin is a good reminder that evil is far more stubborn than has been realized by pacifists who have believed that it could always be overcome by the persuasion of love, but this argument is two-edged for it raises serious questions concerning the hope that the victory of the side that has the better case may not once again be misused and become merely another stage in an endless cycle of wars. Even though nothing that we can do is good, as is sometimes said in refutation of pacifism, it may still be true that war is the greatest evil. The matter cannot be settled by appeal to the doctrine of original sin.

Christians who are not pacifists can agree with the pacifist that violence against persons, especially mass violence against innocent persons, is desperately evil and that in modern war, when once one has consented to war in principle, there seems no stopping place this side of the most diabolical cruelty. We may seek to assure ourselves that there are limits beyond which we would not go, but it is indeed difficult to draw the line anywhere when once one becomes a part of the military machine. I believe that, however much one may criticize the blindness to the issues of this war which have stemmed from the pacifist movement, one must admit that the disillusionment concerning all war that underlies the great momentum of that movement rests upon insights that must not be lost. In particular, this should mean that from now on, in the Christian Church, the burden of proof should be taken off the pacifist and placed upon those who say that the time has come to make a startling

exception to all that we have taught concerning human relations. It is not perfectionism to dwell on the peculiar contradiction between war and Christianity, and to reject participation in war as consent to the greatest of evils. It may, however, be a mistake to assume that the triumph of no evil can be worse than the sin and the tragedy that accompany resistance to it.

When everything has been said in favor of the claim of pacifism to be in a special way the Christian position, I think that it can be shown that pacifism is not a self-sufficient political strategy open at all times to the nation and to those who are responsible for public policy, and that, as Christians have responsibility for public policy, it does not represent the only type of decision open to Christians who seek to be sensitive and obedient. There are four reasons that lead me to this conclusion.

Double Imperative of Christian Love

1. Christian love involves a double imperative. On the one hand it is an imperative against violence; but, also, it makes us responsible for the restraint of evil. In concrete situations we find a conflict between those two sides of the imperative of love, and there is no law carrying its own prescription for application to such situations which can resolve that conflict. We cannot even use the example of Jesus as one to be imitated because His function was different from that of those responsible for public policy. Moreover, the historical circumstances of His life were not the same as those that we face. The struggle of the Jews against the Roman Empire was a more hopeless struggle than, for example, the attempt of the Chinese to limit the area of Japanese control. I believe also that Jesus was sufficiently influenced by the apocalyptic thinking of His time to be able to concentrate upon the Kingdom of God in absolute terms, to the neglect of the immediate political consequences of His choice. This concentration upon the Kingdom in absolute terms enabled Jesus to teach an ethic that would be the norm for every future situation, but not a law to be applied mechanically to all concrete problems.

When violence is already in progress and the question at issue is not that of violence or no violence, but whether one side is to be able to dictate to the other terms of surrender, then those who are responsible for public policy may be obliged to use force to prevent such a result. This responsibility is clearest when what is involved is not merely a shifting of boundaries with the prospect of continuity of institutions under a new sovereignty but the kind of political tyranny that now controls most of Europe and Korea. Such tyranny not only destroys national independence; it stifles the spiritual life of the people, forcing the in-

dependent minds into silence and controlling the education of the children in the interests of the dominant race. Not only pacifists, but also many who are not pacifists, have frequently said that no nation can win a modern war, that at most, one side can achieve only nominal success. That argument has lulled us into assuming that it is important to limit the area of war or to stop war, but not to be much concerned about the military outcome. Recent events have shown that this argument is not always valid. Unless there is continued resistance to Germany, those who live under German rule will not regard German success as "nominal."* If it is possible to prevent the extension of such a tyranny, it is right to do so at the cost of violence. Whether or not it is possible depends on the circumstances, and on them the Christian gospel can throw no light. If the pacifist says, "Wait, this tyranny will defeat itself, and crumble in time," the reply is that though it may be true that the tyranny will crumble, that very crumbling will depend upon resistance offered to it at some point, resistance from without or from within.

Pacifists and Public Responsibility

2. No nation as a nation can be expected to have the moral discipline to live according to the pacifist faith, paying the price of the Cross rather than defending itself, rather than preparing to defend itself. Nations with mixed populations are not able to play the role that may be open to a small Christian group. It is often suggested that the non-violent policy of Denmark may be an illustration of how a nation can be pacifistic. But, while it may be true that when resistance is impossible such a policy is expedient for the nation, Denmark in not resisting, became an unwilling instrument of Germany in her attacks upon Norway and upon England. Statesmen in time of national danger have a clear obligation to provide for the defense of their people. Any persons responsible for public policy who fail, for example, to provide for defense against air-raids are recreant to their duty unless their people deliberately choose to remain undefended in the light of full knowledge of the facts. The possibility of such a deliberate choice on the part of any people is remote indeed. The pacifist may seek to persuade the people to make that choice, but if he fails he has no right to use any position of political responsibility he may have to frustrate that will to be prepared for defense.

C. J. Cadoux, who has long been a leader of the

* NOTE.—A manifesto signed by fifty-one of the leading Christian pacifists in America, including a large proportion of the most influential voices in the American pulpit, in analyzing the possible results of war, speaks only of two possibilities: "the inevitable exhaustion of all concerned and the nominal success of one party or the other." This appears to have been written in May, 1940. (*Fellowship*, June, 1940.)

British pacifists, sees most clearly this limitation which the pacifist should accept. He shows that only a pacifist nation can follow a pacifist policy. He says: "I know enough of the history and character of war to be profoundly distrustful of the possibility of getting any lasting peace on the basis of military victory, however complete it might be, and however sure we felt of winning it. But I do not expect the country at large to be able to pledge itself to adopt my method, and I am therefore ready to recognize as a second best its adoption of the only means of checking Hitler which as a community it knows—namely, by force of arms. I am quite sure that it will be much worse for the world if Hitler wins this war than if the Allies win it. I therefore have a conscientious objection, not only to fighting myself, but to obstructing the Government and my fellow-citizens generally in doing what they believe to be right." The tenability of Cadoux's refusal to fight when he evidently believes that in view of the actual alternatives it is better for the nation to fight than to surrender will arouse debate. Perhaps it can be defended best if it is not based on an absolute negation of violence but on a call to absolute concentration upon redemptive work. But this type of pacifism sees the problem as it is, whereas pacifists who lobby against national defense and aid to Britain are setting up as a second best the kind of peace-making that is now associated with the word, "appeasement."

Strategy of Non-Violence and Censorship

3. The conviction of most American pacifists that there are no obstacles which a strategy of non-violence cannot overcome if enough of us are willing to pay the price does not fit all situations. The most baffling example of a situation which does not fit is to be found when it is necessary to deal with a nation which, because of censorship and propaganda, is impervious to moral persuasion. How can we persuade by word, by action, even by suffering, when we cannot get beyond the spiritual walls built by censorship and propaganda? Even love would seem to be weakness and hypocrisy and there is always so much evil in the past of the nation that may have a relatively just cause that propaganda can easily misrepresent the motives behind its policy. I do not mean that the people in any great nation are all impervious to persuasion were it possible for them to know the truth. But it is impossible for them to know facts that are available to the outside world. There must be some measure of spiritual continuity resulting from confrontation by the same facts, as well as from common standards and loyalties between victims and oppressors, if such moral-pressure is to win the hearts of the latter group. Gandhi's technique of non-violence gains results in dealing with the British government, which allows publicity for his every move and

which is itself responsive to a large section of public opinion favorable to the cause of India. But one can only imagine how much attention Gandhi's fasts would have if he were in a Nazi concentration camp; his death would be welcomed by his keepers, and it would probably be announced that he was shot while trying to escape. Such a strategy of non-violence would have no chance of making an impression upon the people in the oppressing nation if Gandhi were a Czech, a Pole or a Korean.

When a situation does arise in which there is no non-violent way of preventing aggression or tyranny, those responsible for short-run consequences are obliged to use military force for that purpose if there is any hope of success. Whether or not there is hope of success cannot be deduced from any absolute ethical principle. If the pacifist turns political analyst and offers advice to the effect that there is no such hope, let him not eke out arguments based upon inadequate evidence with a half-concealed absolute that begs the question. When public opinion is not ready for the pacifist strategy or when that strategy does not fit the objective situation, *someone must act and must take responsibility for short-run consequences as things actually are*. It is too late for a policy based upon choices that might have been made ten years before.

4. I do not believe that pacifists, especially in America, face the problem that arises when they themselves do not bear the brunt of the suffering to which their policy of non-violence may contribute. American pacifists talk much about the Cross, but the suffering in this situation—I do not say "the Cross" because it is mostly involuntary suffering—is not borne by them but by people in China, in London, in the nations of Europe that have lost their freedom. Knowing many pacifists as well as I do, I have no doubt that if there were a way by which they could divert this suffering to themselves, they would choose to do so, but there is no such way open to them. When there is no redemptive way of the Cross open to Christians in a situation, it is important that they not disguise their responsibility for the increase of the sufferings of others by the use of words that suggest falsely that they are the ones who suffer.

Alternative to Christian Pacifism

In this discussion of pacifism I have sought to show only one thing—that pacifism does not provide a short-cut to Christian decision in all situations. The role of the pacifist is for the individual and for the minority group and not for the statesman or for those who are responsible for public policy. The pacifist should not claim to have absolute guidance for the next step when possibilities are so limited that there is no choice save resistance or the encouragement of

aggression or tyranny. But the statesmen and those responsible for public policy should never close their minds to the insights of the pacifist. He has no self-sufficient strategy which he can prescribe for them, but he can remind them of those aspects of the truth that they are in the greatest danger of forgetting. The pacifist may for the moment be choosing a course that is politically irresponsible, but he is not socially irresponsible as he seeks to find ways in which to correct the tendencies towards hatred and madness which, if unchecked, will make a decent peace impossible. So, even his political irresponsibility may have constructive political consequences.

It cannot be said too often that the alternative to Christian Pacifism is not Christian militarism. If the former is a heresy, as some would claim, what is to be said about the latter? No, there is a third alternative that is now widespread in the Christian Church. Its strength may be a result of the pacifist movement in part because we find it especially in those countries where pacifism has been most influential. This third position involves a Christian perspective upon the struggle in which the Christian participates. The non-pacifist Christian knows that this struggle had its origin in the sins and failures of all the great powers. He knows that military victory carries with it great temptations, and he does not forget the results of the last great victory. He knows that the Germans are human beings and that what he is fighting against is really a problem for them as well as for the world at large, even when they do not see it so. He knows that while it is impossible to negotiate with the Nazis and is not deceived concerning the extent to which the Nazis are supported by the Germans, it will be necessary to live with the Germans and that force alone will not make this possible. He never loses his sense of membership in the world Church and prepares himself now to overcome the barriers which war has created within the Church at the earliest possible moment. And he rejoices that even now some indirect lines of communication exist across all such barriers. Perhaps the best test of this kind of non-pacifist Christianity is that those who represent it are glad that the pacifist tradition is alive in the Church and welcome the contribution of the Christian pacifists, especially those who see the bitterness of the dilemma that confronts the nation and who do not place the sanction of their absolute behind isolationist policies. Perhaps it is not too much to hope that such an attitude might elicit a corresponding spirit of charity in the pacifist wing of the Church and persuade it to judge the non-pacifists in terms which avoid the sin of self-righteousness.

IMPERIALISM AND IRRESPONSIBILITY

Imperialism at its worst is the subjugation and exploitation of the national or international community by the powerful. At its best it represents an egoistic corruption of a responsible attitude toward the task of organizing human communities. The sin of imperialism in its less grievous form may well be a less dangerous form of selfishness than an irresponsible attitude toward the task of organizing the human community.

Most moralists have an almost morbid fear of imperialism, but they are frequently complacent toward the more covert but the more grievous sin of irresponsibility. They like to accuse Britain of imperialism; but they fail to recognize that the greatest mistake of the United States and Great Britain after the world war was not imperialism, but the failure to take a responsible attitude toward world organization. This irresponsibility helped to betray France into an hysterical and dangerous effort to gain security by crippling her erstwhile foe. Britain tried to make Germany strong in order to restore the balance of power in Europe and France tried to keep Germany weak. The United States washed its hands of the whole problem. The consequence of these contradictory policies, wrong in themselves, and doubly wrong in the tendency of each to aggravate the vices of the other, was the rise of the horrible tyranny which now threatens the world. Professor Arnold Wolfers has recorded this tragic history with rare impartiality in his book, *Britain and France Between Two Wars*.

We shall face this problem anew, should we be fortunate enough to escape subjugation to this tyranny. No world organization will be possible without a willingness on the part of Britain and the United States to assume "imperial" tasks in the best sense of the word. Tragic history has persuaded Britain of the necessity of such a course, though it is always possible that fatigue may tempt her to renounce this destiny. We shall have to overcome impulses of irresponsibility which have reached the depth of a psychosis in recent decades. We persuade ourselves that we withdrew from Europe because it made a bad peace, and do not recognize that the bad peace was partly prompted by our previous withdrawal. In order to understand the validity of this indictment, it is necessary to look at the whole tragic drama of Versailles and recognize to what degree we were willing to bestow a world organization on Europe, but unwilling to assume detailed obligations.

In the Lord's parable it is the servant who hid his talent in the ground who is condemned. The other servants seemed to have profited from usurious interest rates. But censure falls upon the irresponsible servant alone.

R. N.

The World Church: News and Notes

Norwegian Bishops Protest

All seven Bishops of the Norwegian State Church have addressed a communication to the German Minister of the Department of Education and Church in which they express their grievances against certain features of the occupation of Norway in unequivocal words.

The Bishops call attention to the fact that the Church has a constitutional status in Norway and that it is therefore "imperative that the Church should know clearly whether the State . . . accepts and honors the legal and moral obligations contained in the Church's articles of faith and in the Bible." The Bishops declare that in accordance with Lutheran doctrine, they had advised their congregations to be obedient to the State and to give due respect to all authorities. But now they want to know whether the occupying power has not violated the basic laws and thereby invalidated the counsel which the Church had given to the faithful.

The Bishops have three primary grievances. (1) They call attention to the fact that the government is encouraging the violence of the storm troopers, that the watchword of these troopers is "he who hits once shall be hit tenfold" and that "the revolting nature of these single acts of violence is such as to make them a problem concerning the security of society as a whole."

(2) The second grievance is that the Nazis have destroyed the independence of the courts by making the appointment and discharge of judges subject to Nazi control. The Bishops maintain that this "will lead to the most fateful consequences, since freedom of the courts is of vital importance to security and justice."

(3) The final grievance concerns the abolition by the occupying power of the minister's professional oath of silence. They declare, "our right to professional secrecy is not only guaranteed by law, but has always been a fundamental requirement in the churchly calling when we minister to sorrow and receive confessions from people in trouble." The Bishops call this right of secrecy the "Magna Carta of conscience."

It is not likely that this episcopal communication will be answered and it is probable that the Bishops did not expect an answer.

Lutherans and Catholics Confer in Germany

The impetus given to ecumenical Christianity by the present world conflict is well reflected in a recent meeting of Lutherans and Roman Catholics in Germany. The *Schoenere Zukunft*, a Roman Catholic periodical, describes the meeting as follows: "The subject of the discussion was the Church, and its aim was to gain a clear picture of the convictions held by both parties. Misunderstandings were to be cleared away, and remaining conflicts were to be brought before God in common prayer. Common prayer was the soul of the meeting, principally the petition, 'forgive us our trespasses, especially the great guilt of dividing the faith.' After the celebration of the Mass, the Epistle to the Ephesians was read alternately by a Catholic and Protestant clergyman."

The addresses were mostly concerned with the nature of the Church in the New Testament and in Catholic and Protestant theology. One significant topic of discussion was "The Unity of the Church as a Church of Law and Love."

The report continues, "A Lutheran pastor testified that many prejudices were cleared away during these days. It also became clear that fundamental conflict still remained, especially on the question of the authority of the Papacy."

Dutch Christians Are Active in Opposition

The Nazi paper, *Deutsche Zeitung fuer die Niederlanden*, complains that, "the Dutch churches have been veritable centers of opposition to the Reich." Many churchmen are in concentration camps because of their outspoken opposition.

Students of Dutch politics are aware that the relation between politics and religion is peculiarly intimate in Holland. The fact that the Catholics had their own political party is not unique in European politics, but the Calvinist orientation of the leading conservative party of Holland was unique. The former Calvinist Prime Minister, Dr. Hendrikus Colijn, expressed the typical attitude of his party at a recent mass meeting. He declared: "Whoever knows anything about our people knows that we will have nothing to do with imported extremism. . . . We have shown the occupying power that we cannot shed our national characteristics in choosing the political path we wish to follow. . . . Nobody can lift the veil of the future, but those who take the Bible and the history of the Dutch people as their guide can have confidence that The Netherlands will rise again."

The unique relation between Dutch Calvinism and Dutch patriotism is revealed as strikingly in a recent address of the present Prime Minister of Holland, as it was in the quoted address of the ex-Prime Minister. Speaking in London to a Dutch-British Christian fellowship, he declared: "I consider a Calvinist the freest human being in God's liberated world, dedicated to that conception of life which ascribes to Christ the highest place in this world as absolute sovereign over all earthly powers, and therefore willing, if necessary, to resist any earthly oppressor. But I also remain a Netherlander, member of a community that harbours different creeds, Roman Catholics cordially cooperating with Calvinists and Modernists, groups which in later years have learned how to understand one another more and more and to work together for their country."

The Church Survives in Russia

The latest issue of the *Anti-Relioznik*, organ of the Russian Communist League of the Godless, complains that women lay readers are beginning to function in some of the churches and are rallying the faithful. The magazine declares: "A woman reader does not differ in any way from a priest. The change of the faithful to self-service indicates that we cannot limit ourselves in our anti-religious work to the disrobing of reactionary

priests. Many faithful nowadays know how reactionary and inimical are the church people. The authority of the priest is not high among them. But they do not understand as yet that every religion is reactionary no matter in what form it is presented."

In another issue of the same periodical further testimony is offered concerning the tenacity of religious life in Russia despite persecutions. It says: "It is often believed that the survival of religious sentiments is to be met with only among elderly people, and that youth is entirely refractory to such teachings. In present-day youth, however, and even among children, religious prejudices are to be discovered. Some members of the Communist Youth Organizations, as well as some members of the Party, have not yet entirely emancipated themselves from religion. . . . Communism and religion, let us say it again, are irreconcilably hostile to each other."

The Church's Relation to Petain

Cardinal Liernart, the Archbishop of Lille, declared in a recent address: "Our misfortunes are not the consequence of the armistice, but the consequence of the defeat. It is this which has put our national existence within a hair's breadth of ruin. Those who signed the armistice are men who have the right to our respect, because they came to our help in the day of our humiliation."

This statement has been generally interpreted as a refutation of the position of the de Gaullists. It must be observed that Pastor Marc Boegner, president of the French Protestant Federation, has also called upon Protestants to rally around Marshal Petain.

On the other hand the Catholic Church, looking toward the signing of a concordat, is reported to be non-committal toward overtures from the Petain government. Despite the Vichy government's reinstitution of religious instruction in the schools and the abolition of other disabilities of religious communities, the Church seems anxious not to identify itself too closely with the Petain regime.

Czech Catholic Journal Accepts New Order

Despite the large number of Catholics who oppose Hitler on religious grounds, there are naturally those within the Church who think that a totalitarian world would be more hospitable to Catholicism than a democratic, partly Protestant and capitalistic world. Thus a leading Catholic Czech newspaper writes:

"There is no Catholic in Europe who should shed a tear to see the collapse of democratic political disorder and who, furthermore, would not welcome the fall of economic liberalism, which has been denounced by the Pope's leading Catholic ideologists because it misuses working people in favor of a few capitalistic speculators."

"Czech Catholics see a clear line of duty, namely to contribute with all their strength to the consolidation of the new order in Bohemia and Moravia. Like the entire Czech nation, Czech Catholics stand united behind the Czech President, Dr. Hacha."



CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th Street New York, N. Y.

\$1.50 per year

10 cents per copy

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR
Chairman
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM
JOHN A. MACKAY

FRANCIS P. MILLER
EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
RHODA E. MCCULLOCH

SPONSORS

JOHN COLEMAN BENNETT	FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL
WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN	ELIZABETH C. MORROW
WILLIAM F. COCHRAN	JOHN R. MOTT
HENRY SLOANE COFFIN	WILLIAM ALLAN NEILSON
J. HARRY COTTON	JUSTIN WROE NIXON
HAROLD W. DODDS	HOWARD CHANDLER ROBBINS
SHERWOOD EDDY	WILLIAM SCARLETT
FRANK PORTER GRAHAM	HENRY K. SHERRILL
HENRY W. HOBSON	ROBERT E. SPEER
IVAN LEE HOLT	CHARLES P. TAFT
DOUGLAS HORTON	HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER
LYNN HAROLD HOUGH	CHARLES T. WHITE
W. P. LADD	

Remarkable Response

Subscriptions are pouring in upon us at such a rate that we have reached a circulation with our second issue which we had set as our goal for the end of the first year. We are still unable to answer personal letters to the Editors and we beg our readers not to send manuscripts. We publish only one article per issue and these articles are contracted for months in advance.

Please note our special introductory prices.

For single subscriptions, \$1.00 per year;

Canada and foreign \$1.25.

For bundle orders:

A bundle of 10 or more copies to one address costs 75c. per copy per year.

Fifty or more copies to one address cost 60c. per copy.

Fifty copies of six consecutive issues to one address cost \$10.

Twenty copies of six consecutive issues sent to one address cost \$5.

CHRISTIANITY AND CRISIS
601 West 120th Street
NEW YORK, N. Y.
Return Postage Guaranteed

SEC. 562, P.L.
U. S. POST
PAID
NEW YORK, N. Y.
PERMIT NO.